

**Latimer, Becky**

**From:** David Hevey <[David.Hevey@dominionenergy.com](mailto:David.Hevey@dominionenergy.com)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 31, 2021 4:27 PM  
**To:** PSC\_Contact  
**Subject:** [External] Docket Number: 2020-229-E

My name is David Hevey. I reside in Bluffton, SC, and my investment in solar energy and storage exceeds \$100,000 after tax credits. As a result of this investment, I produce approximately 75% of my electrical needs.

I am opposed to Dominion Energy's proposal and strongly urge you to reject it. The current relationship between Alternative Energy Producers and the Monopoly Energy Provider, Dominion Energy, is symbiotic, in that we mutually benefit via the "Net Metering" relationship.

However, these proposed changes will drastically alter this relationship, making it a parasitic arrangement in which the state mandates that Dominion repurpose my capital investment to benefit a publicly traded monopoly. For example:

- Dominion's proposal to increase the "Basic Facility Charge" from \$9.00 per month to \$19.50 per month for solar customers represents an increase of 117%, with no additional benefit to me and no additional cost to Dominion Energy.
- Dominion's proposed, new "Solar Subscription Fee" will result in a new fee to me of \$118.80 per month, with no additional benefit to me and no additional cost to Dominion Energy.
- Dominion is asking the state to sanction a new, lower buy-back rate that is drastically below my cost of production, only to resell it to my neighbor at four times that cost, resulting in a loss to me of approximately \$40.00 per month.
- Combined, these new fees will result in a fixed monthly rate in excess of \$165.00 before I turn on a light, representing an increase of almost 200%. While the cost of production (Invested capital) has been borne by me, these changes ensure that Dominion Energy profits from my investment, rather than me.

Dominion Energy justifies these additional fees as an attempt to "Reduce costs imposed upon all customers who do not utilize rooftop solar", however, there is no cost to Dominion Energy associated with a residential solar installation, therefore there is no cost to impose upon non-solar customers and they remain unharmed. The entirety of the cost is borne by me in the form of my capital investment.

The increased fees are clearly intended to recover the lost revenue related to my investment, but lost revenue is not a cost to be recovered through additional fees. To suggest that any revenue loss associated with my capital investment must be recovered through higher fees is a ridiculous attempt to repurpose my capital investment to the benefit of a publicly traded monopoly and to discourage similar investments. I strongly urge the state to reject this egregious request.

David Hevey

Bluffton, SC. ;